United Nations S/2014/553

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 July 2014

Original: English

Letter dated 31 July 2014 from the Ombudsperson to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to submit herewith the eighth report of the Office of the Ombudsperson, pursuant to paragraph 20 (c) of annex II to Security Council resolution 2161 (2014), according to which the Ombudsperson shall submit biannual reports to the Council summarizing her activities. The report describes the activities of the Office of the Ombudsperson in the six months since the previous report was issued, covering the period from 1 February to 31 July 2014.

I would appreciate it if the present letter and the report were brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council and issued as a document of the Council.

(*Signed*) Kimberly **Prost**
Ombudsperson

14-58609 (E) 210814

Please recycle

Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson pursuant to Security Council resolution 2161 (2014)

I. Background

1. The present report provides an update of the activities undertaken by the Office of the Ombudsperson since the issuance of the seventh report of the Office (S/2014/73), dated 31 January 2014.

II. Activities related to delisting cases

General

2. The primary activities of the Office of the Ombudsperson during the reporting period related to delisting requests submitted by individuals and entities.

Delisting cases

3. During the reporting period, four new cases were submitted to the Office of the Ombudsperson. All four petitions were accepted. The total number of delisting petitions submitted since the establishment of the Office was 55 as at 31 July 2014. Unless the petitioner requests otherwise, all names remain confidential while under consideration and in the case of denial or withdrawal of a petition.

4. In total, the Ombudsperson has submitted 48 comprehensive reports to the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions 1904 (2009), 1989 (2011), 2083 (2012) and 2161 (2014) concerning Al-Qaida and associated individuals and entities since the Office was established. During the reporting period, she submitted four reports and appeared before the Committee on four occasions to present five cases.

5. Since the issuance of the seventh report, two individuals[1] have been delisted through the Ombudsperson process and three requests have been denied.[2]

6. Cumulatively, since the Office was established, 46 cases involving requests from an individual, an entity or a combination of both have been completed.[3] As a result of the consideration of these cases through the Ombudsperson process, 34 individuals and 27 entities have been delisted, 1 entity has been removed as an alias of a listed entity, six delisting requests have been refused and one petition has been withdrawn. In addition, three individuals have been delisted by the Committee before the Ombudsperson process was completed. A description of the status of all of the cases, as at 31 July 2014, is contained in the annex to the present report.

7. Nine cases were active at the time of preparation of the present report. The four requests submitted to the Office during the reporting period were presented by individuals. In total, 47 of the 55 cases have been brought by individuals, 2 by an individual together with one or more entities and 6 by entities alone. In 26 of the 55 cases, the petitioner is or was assisted by legal counsel.

[1] Yacine Ahmed Nacer and Youssef ben Abdul Baki Ben Youcef Abdaoui.

[2] As of the release of this report, reasons for the decision to retain have been provided in two of the three cases.

[3] This figure includes three individuals delisted by the Committee before the Ombudsperson process was completed.

Gathering of information from States

8. In the four new cases, 12 requests for information have been sent to date, to eight States. With respect to the four cases for which Comprehensive Reports were submitted to the Committee during the reporting period, there were four instances when a State from which information had been requested failed to respond. In addition to the responses received from States to which requests were specifically directed, some Committee members provided information as a result of the general circulation of petitions. Importantly, in all four cases the designating States and States of residence all provided responses.

9. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson met on three occasions with officials in capitals on specific cases to gather information directly.

Dialogue with the petitioner

10. During the six months under review, the Ombudsperson interacted with all petitioners during the dialogue phase of pending cases, including through e-mail exchanges, telephone discussions and face-to-face interviews. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson travelled to interview one petitioner in person.

Access to classified or confidential information

11. Two new arrangements for access to classified or confidential information were entered into during the reporting period, with Finland and Luxembourg.[4] To date, there is one formal agreement with Austria and 13 arrangements with Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

12. Further progress on expanding the list, in particular to other States often involved in the Ombudsperson process, is urgently needed and discussions are ongoing with a number of States in this regard.

III. Summary of activities related to the development of the Office of the Ombudsperson

General

13. Activities to further develop and strengthen the Office of the Ombudsperson continued during the reporting period to the extent possible.

Outreach and publicizing of the Office

14. The Ombudsperson participated in some outreach activities to the extent possible given the limitations on time and resources.

15. On 13 February, the Ombudsperson took part in a panel at the London School of Economics, hosted by the Department of Law and Matrix Chambers, debating the judgement by the European Court of Justice in the *Kadi* appeal case, entitled "United Nations Ombudsperson v. judicial review in Security Council sanctions

[4] Finland on 31 March and Luxembourg on 20 June.

decision-making". The panel was comprised of the Ombudsperson, Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism Ben Emmerson and Professor Carol Harlow of the London School of Economics. Also in February, the Ombudsperson delivered the first annual lecture for the Nottingham International Law and Security Centre on the Office of the Ombudsperson in the context of a perspective on international law innovations and the Security Council.

16. Later in February, the Ombudsperson gave a presentation on the work of her Office for the National Security Law programme at Fordham University in New York City. In March, the Ombudsperson delivered the keynote address on the work of the Ombudsperson and the growing intersection of national and international law at a meeting of the Canadian National Judicial Institute in Vancouver, Canada. In April, the Ombudsperson participated in a panel on the use of confidential/classified material at the joint American Society of International Law 108th Annual Meeting and International Law Association 76th Biennial Conference in Washington, D.C. In May, the Ombudsperson delivered remarks at the formal opening of the global experts meeting of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force on building capacity for terrorist designations and asset freezing in New York.

Interaction with the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1989 (2011) concerning Al-Qaida and associated individuals and entities and with the Monitoring Team

17. Since 31 January 2014, the Ombudsperson has appeared before the Committee on four occasions to present five cases: on 11 February, in the case of Yacine Ahmed Nacer Youssef (delisted; formerly QI.N.165.04); on 25 February, in the case of Youssef ben Abdul Baki Ben Youcef Abdaoui (delisted; formerly QI.A.90.03); on 21 April, in the case of one individual; and on 24 June, in the cases of two individuals. In addition, the Ombudsperson provided a number of written updates to the Committee in relation to various cases as they progressed through each phase.

18. As previously, the Ombudsperson and staff in her Office continued to engage regularly with the Coordinator and members of the Monitoring Team. The Team continued to provide relevant information in accordance with paragraph 4 of annex II to Security Council resolution 2161 (2014). During the reporting period the Team also gave expert advice on issues relevant to particular requests and assisted on several occasions in discussions with petitioners.

Liaison with States, intergovernmental organizations, United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations

19. The Ombudsperson continued to interact with States during the reporting period, in particular States of relevance to the pending delisting petitions. She had several bilateral meetings with States interested in the work of her Office to discuss general issues and recent legal cases. She maintained contacts and held discussions with the informal Group of Like-Minded States on Targeted Sanctions.[5] In February, the Ombudsperson held a series of meetings and discussions with European Union officials and bodies in Brussels including a briefing to the Foreign Relations

[5] Comprising Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Germany, Finland, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

Counsellors Working Party. The Ombudsperson also met with some State officials in their capitals for general discussions and to obtain information regarding particular cases.

20. The Ombudsperson and staff in her Office continued to interact with representatives of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force and the Executive Directorate of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, as well as with the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

21. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson also had meetings with representatives of non-governmental organizations including Security Council Report, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International. The Ombudsperson also held meetings with government lawyers and private practitioners, in New York and during trips to London, Washington, D.C., and Brussels, on a variety of legal issues related to her work, including the question of the use of confidential material. The Ombudsperson also had several exchanges with academics on the work of her Office.

Working methods and research

22. As in previous working periods, casework involved open-source research and contacts with journalists and authors to collect information on and verify sources for publicly available case-related material.

23. The Ombudsperson continued to follow developments with regard to relevant national and regional legal cases. She also collected and reviewed relevant press articles and reports of non-governmental organizations and academic articles pertinent to the work of her Office. She discussed general legal issues of relevance with counsel in the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat, and that Office has continued to provide assistance and advice to the Ombudsperson on specific legal issues that have arisen.

Website

24. The website of the Office of the Ombudsperson (www.un.org/en/sc/ombudsperson) continues to be revised and updated. A chart describing the Ombudsperson process has been added.

IV. Other activities

Notifications of listing

25. In accordance with paragraph 18 (b) of annex II to Security Council resolution 2083 (2012) and paragraph 20 (b) of annex II to resolution 2161 (2014), when an individual or entity is added to the list and relevant States have been notified, the Ombudsperson is to send a notification directly to that individual or entity if there is a known address.

26. In the six months since the seventh report was issued, two individuals and five entities have been added to the Al-Qaida sanctions list. Each of those listings was considered with reference to the question of notification. In none of the cases was an

address available, nor was the information provided sufficiently detailed for there to be any reasonable prospect of the notification reaching the addressee.

27. Consistent with the intention of paragraph 20 (b) of resolution 2161 (2014), the Ombudsperson sent similar notification letters to individuals listed prior to the establishment of the Office where address information was available and to any individuals or entities for whom address information subsequently became available. In response to requests, in the reporting period the Ombudsperson received addresses from five States for previously listed individuals with respect to 21 individuals. The Ombudsperson is in the process of sending notifications to these individuals.

Miscellaneous matters

28. The Ombudsperson continued to receive and respond to various inquiries about the Committee and the Ombudsperson process. This included requests for assistance and information from State representatives, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations, lawyers, listed individuals, the media, academics, students and the general public.

V. Future work

29. As in previous reporting periods, the paramount activity of the Office of the Ombudsperson will continue to relate to the delisting requests. Four petitions were received during the present reporting period, an increase since the last reporting period.[6] While some decrease in the general trend is to be expected in future given the finite nature of the list, the process continues to attract a steady number of requests. As noted previously, some listed persons and entities remain unaware of the Ombudsperson process and efforts to disseminate information in that regard continue and may possibly trigger additional applications in upcoming months.

30. Given the inconsistent trend and various factors noted in the previous report, it remains difficult to anticipate the future caseload with any certainty. However, on the basis of recent patterns of activity and taking these various factors into account, it is reasonable to assume that the Office of the Ombudsperson will receive approximately four requests in the next six-month period and that eight cases will be active at the end of the next reporting period.

31. Because of the continuing challenges associated with the lack of access to classified material, the development of arrangements or agreements for access to classified or confidential information will remain the second priority for the Office of the Ombudsperson in the upcoming period. The Office will maintain its efforts to raise the issue with States, to enable the Ombudsperson to access critical information of relevance to delisting petitions.

32. As noted in the previous report, it is necessary, after over four years of operation, to review and revise procedural documents related to the Office and to develop systems for better information management including a searchable database. These measures will ensure a more permanent institutional memory for the Office and allow for easy cross-reference and research in future cases where there

[6] Two cases were submitted in the last reporting period.

may be overlapping facts, issues or applicable principles. This work will continue in the next reporting period, to the extent that resources permit.

33. Finally, the Ombudsperson and her Office will continue to carry out outreach and liaison activities as appropriate, in order to make the process more visible and understandable to potential petitioners and other interested actors.

VI. Observations and conclusions

Due process

34. The Ombudsperson process continues to operate in compliance with the fundamental principles of fairness highlighted in previous reports.[7] In all cases completed in the reporting period, the petitioner was informed of the case underlying the listing and had an opportunity to respond and to be heard by the decision maker through the Ombudsperson's comprehensive report. While confidential material, which could not be disclosed to the petitioner, was relied on in one of the cases considered in the reporting period, the Ombudsperson was of the view that on the basis of the totality of the disclosed material in that instance, the petitioner did know the substance of the case if not all the details. All the Committee decisions on delisting petitions made during the reporting period were premised solely on information gathered by the Ombudsperson and followed her recommendation. In no case did the Committee take a decision by consensus contrary to the recommendation and no matter was referred to the Security Council. As a result, each petitioner benefited from an effective, independent review of the basis for the listing and the information supporting it.

35. All of the features of the Ombudsperson process have been retained in resolution 2161 (2014) and the mandate of the Ombudsperson has been extended for an additional 30-month period from 15 July 2015. The essential time frames, which contribute appreciably to the overall fairness of the process, have been maintained with some additional deadlines added to enhance the timeliness of aspects of the procedure.[8] In addition, paragraph 3 of annex II to resolution 2161 (2014) now provides the Ombudsperson with the discretion to shorten the information-gathering period in cases where all the designating States consulted do not object to delisting. This will augment the fairness of the process for petitioners by allowing for a reduced time frame for consideration of the request in appropriate cases.

Cooperation of States

36. State cooperation in terms of responses remained strong in the reporting period. All designating States and States of residence have replied in the cases completed. The four States that did not respond were contacted as relevant States which were thought potentially to hold pertinent information. Of those, two had only a technical link to the case and the other two faced internal circumstances that may well have precluded easy access to information from authorities.

---

[7] See in particular the detailed discussion in the sixth report (S/2013/452, paras. 28-32).

[8] See the discussion below on the time limit for the transmittal of reasons by the Committee to the Ombudsperson.

37. During the reporting period, there were serious problems in one case with access to the petitioner and significant delays in the submission of a substantive response. However, through the diligent and extraordinary efforts of officials of the State involved, in New York and in the capital, the challenges were ultimately overcome, evidencing once again the strong cooperation of States with the Office of the Ombudsperson.

38. The major challenge to cooperation remains access to confidential/classified material. In the reporting period there were practical achievements of importance in some individual cases and two new arrangements were agreed. However, efforts continue to increase the number of arrangements/agreements in particular with States that are frequently called upon to provide information in delisting cases.

Provision of reasons for delisting and retention

39. The extensive delays in the communication of the reasons by the Committee in delisting cases and the relatively limited factual and analytical references in the reasons were noted in the seventh report (A/2014/73, paras. 40-41). Security Council resolution 2161 (2014) partly addresses the problem by providing for a 60-day deadline for the transmittal of reasons by the Committee to the Ombudsperson. This time limit is especially welcome in that it applies to outstanding cases where reasons have been delayed for an extensive period. However, this change does not address the content of the letters in delisting cases and, as discussed in the seventh report, it could result in further limitations in that respect.

40. The deadline has also been made applicable to retention cases, which will also be helpful. However, resolution 2161 (2014) does not address the most serious concern with respect to reasons in retention cases. Paragraphs 14 and 15 of annex II to resolution 2083 (2012) were amended by the language in paragraphs 16 and 17 of annex II to resolution 2161 (2014) to better reflect the Ombudsperson procedure by providing for the Committee to convey to the Ombudsperson, at the end of the process, whether the sanction measures are to be retained or terminated, rather than communicating a decision. This amendment makes it even more clear that in a case of retention, the listing is maintained on the basis of the recommendation of the Ombudsperson, which has arisen from the analysis contained in the comprehensive report. Nevertheless, paragraph 16 of annex II still provides that the reasons for the refusal of the delisting petition must come from the Committee. As a result, the possibility remains that the reasons provided will be inconsistent with the observations, analysis and findings of the Ombudsperson, rendering the process fundamentally unfair in the particular case.

41. As described previously, the experience to date with the provision of reasons reinforces the importance of the provision of reasons to the fairness and transparency of the process. The addition of a time frame for the delivery of reasons is a positive development, particularly for delisting cases. Nonetheless, further changes are needed to ensure a fair process in each case, with reasons that are substantive in content and consistent with the comprehensive report of the Ombudsperson.

42. As discussed in the seventh report (S/2014/73, paras. 43-48), these problems can best be addressed by making the provision of reasons fully consistent with the process. This can be accomplished by according the responsibility for reasons to the Ombudsperson, in both delisting and retention cases, with appropriate safeguards

regarding the release of confidential material. The only exception would be in the case of a Committee reversal or a Security Council decision, where responsibility for reasons would be left to the Committee and the Council respectively. Such a structure would be properly reflective of the process as a whole and would significantly enhance its fairness, transparency and efficiency.

Transparency of the process: interested States/petitioner

43. Resolution 2161 (2014) brings about some welcome change with respect to the disclosure of information to interested States that are not members of the Security Council. Paragraph 13 of annex II stipulates that, if requested, the Ombudsperson may provide a copy of the comprehensive report to an interested State (designating State, or State of nationality, residence or incorporation), with the approval of the Committee, with any redactions deemed necessary to protect confidential material. Disclosure will be accompanied by a notification to such States emphasizing the discretionary decision to release the report and the need to protect confidentiality, and confirming that the comprehensive report is attributable solely to the Ombudsperson. This is an opportune addition that "codifies" recent practice, enhances transparency and ensures that the petitioner is aware of possible disclosure of the comprehensive report from the beginning of the process.

44. Unfortunately, however, no progress has been made in terms of the transparency of the process from the perspective of the petitioner. The Ombudsperson remains unable to directly divulge the recommendation to the petitioner and there is no provision for disclosure of the comprehensive report.

General transparency of the process: disclosure of the reasons

45. As discussed in detail in the seventh report (S/2014/73, paras. 49-52), the Ombudsperson process also suffers from limited public transparency. As noted, the comprehensive report, which details the reasoning of the Ombudsperson, is not made available to the petitioner or the public. As a result, the only information about a decision that the petitioner will receive is that conveyed through the reasons, which are provided. This is the sole mechanism prescribed by resolution for possible disclosure of factual information and findings in a case other than the Office of the Ombudsperson, the Committee and now, under resolution 2161 (2014), an interested State. However, there is no provision in the resolution for publication of those reasons by the Ombudsperson, a measure that would enhance the general transparency of the process. Unfortunately, resolution 2161 (2014) does not address disclosure by the Ombudsperson, and an obvious deficiency in transparency therefore remains. This is particularly perplexing given that the petitioner is free to disseminate the reasons — in whole or in part — while the Ombudsperson must continue to keep the information confidential. The benefits of, or reasons for, this non-disclosure requirement are opaque.

Mandate for the follow-up of delisting

46. Previous reports[9] have discussed the problem of delisted persons who face the apparent continued application of the sanctions measures, as well as individuals

[9] See, for example, the seventh report (S/2014/73, paras. 63-64); the sixth report (S/2013/452, paras. 53-55); and the fifth report (S/2013/71, paras. 48-49).

who, because of similarity of names and identifiers, are mistakenly categorized as listed persons.

47. This issue is addressed in resolution 2161 (2014) by enabling the Focal Point to receive and transmit to the Committee communications from delisted persons or those claiming false, mistaken or confused identification as listed persons and to communicate the Committee response. The inclusion of some form of measure to address these cases, within a 60-day time constraint, is a welcome development.

48. Nonetheless, the limited experience to date with humanitarian exemption requests assigned to the Focal Point under resolution 2083 (2012) suggests that practical challenges can arise from the introduction of separate mechanisms for different types of requests under one sanctions regime. To date, the requests for humanitarian exemptions have arisen in cases already being dealt with by the Ombudsperson. As a result, the process has been quite confusing for the person seeking the exemption. In addition there has been unnecessary delay and unavoidable duplication of effort on the part of the Focal Point and the Ombudsperson, in these cases. It is possible that similar problems will arise in the context of follow-up requests and cases involving misidentification. However, as indicated, there has been only minimal practice with exemption requests to date and more time is needed to consider the overall effectiveness of that mechanism, as well as the additional process set out in paragraphs 63 and 64 of resolution 2161 (2014).

Independence of the Office of the Ombudsperson

49. Over the four-year period of its operation, the Office of the Ombudsperson has functioned independently in fulfilling the mandate accorded to it by the Security Council. The work of the Office has been carried out autonomously and in each of the concluded cases the individual or entity involved has benefited from a fair and impartial process which has included an objective review of the factual basis for the listing.

50. However, in light of the contractual, administrative and staffing arrangements through which the resolution mandate has been implemented, success in safeguarding the independence of the Ombudsperson and her Office has been due to the personal efforts of the Ombudsperson, relevant officials within the Department of Political Affairs and the staff members assigned to the Office. While achieved in practice, in principle, no separate office has been established and the applicable administrative arrangements, particularly for budget, staffing, staff management and resource utilization, lack the critical features of autonomy. Further, the contractual arrangements for the Ombudsperson are not consistent with the mandate accorded by the Security Council and contain insufficient safeguards for independence. The need for a framework which reflects the independent nature of the Office has been underscored by the Security Council in resolution 2161 (2014) with the addition of the word "independent" in paragraph 46.[10]

51. As described in the seventh report, practical challenges have begun to arise from these structural difficulties. With reference to the issue raised in that report,

[10] "*The Security Council ... Requests* the Secretary-General to continue to strengthen the capacity of the Office of the Ombudsperson by providing necessary resources, including for translation services, as appropriate, to ensure its continued ability to carry out its mandate in an independent, effective and timely manner".

through discussions, arrangements have been put in place to address administrative and logistical issues such that no substantive reports on trips are required from staff assisting the Ombudsperson. However, this issue was merely symptomatic of the wider problem arising directly from the current contractual and administrative arrangements that are in place. Given the welcome extension of the Ombudsperson's mandate for an additional period of 30 months from July 2015, urgent consideration needs to be given to establishing contractual arrangements and a structure that provides for institutional independence for the Ombudsperson and the Office of the Ombudsperson.

Conclusions

52. The Office of the Ombudsperson currently provides individuals and entities listed by the Al-Qaida Sanctions Committee with a fair and accessible recourse, which includes an independent review of factual information and is consistent with the fundamental precepts of fairness. Resolution 2161 (2014) retains all of the features of the process, which makes it a robust mechanism in that regard. Further, as discussed, the resolution includes improvements that will enhance the timeliness and transparency of the procedure.

53. Efforts continue, and some progress is being made, on obtaining access to confidential and classified material relevant to individual requests. The general cooperation of States remains strong.

54. There is some progress on the important question of reasons for the decisions taken to grant or deny the petition contained in resolution 2161 (2014), which should ensure a more timely delivery of reasons. However, there remains a fundamental inconsistency between the decision-making process and the delivery of reasons, particularly in retention cases. This creates the potential for an unfair process if the reasons are not consistent with the comprehensive report of the Ombudsperson.

55. As described above, significant deficiencies remain in the transparency of the process, particularly from the perspective of the petitioner and in relation to the public dissemination of information.

56. Finally, with the extension to the mandate of the Ombudsperson accorded by resolution 2161 (2014), the contractual status of the Ombudsperson and the administrative arrangements surrounding her Office should be reviewed with a view to institutionalizing independence.

57. Nonetheless, the Ombudsperson process, with the improvements achieved in resolution 2161 (2014), should continue to deliver a fair process and contribute to strengthening the effectiveness and credibility of the Al-Qaida sanctions regime of the Security Council.

Annex

Status of cases

Case 1, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
28 July 2010	Transmission of case 1 to the Committee
28 February 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision
1 September 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 2, Safet Ekrem Durguti (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
30 September 2010	Transmission of case 2 to the Committee
26 April 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision to delist
12 August 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 3, one entity (Status: delisting request withdrawn by petitioner)

Date	*Description*
3 November 2010	Transmission of case 3 to the Committee
14 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 August 2011	Withdrawal of petition

Case 4, Shafiq Ben Mohamed Ben Mohammed Al Ayadi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
6 December 2010	Transmission of case 4 to the Committee
29 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 October 2011	Committee decision to delist
8 November 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 5, Tarek Ben Al-Bechir Ben Amara Al-Charaabi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
30 December 2010	Transmission of case 5 to the Committee
26 April 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision to delist
12 August 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 6, Abdul Latif Saleh (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
14 January 2011	Transmission of case 6 to the Committee
17 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 August 2011	Committee decision to delist
8 November 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 7, Abu Sufian Al-Salamabi Muhammed Ahmed Abd Al-Razziq (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
28 January 2011	Transmission of case 7 to the Committee
23 September 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
15 November 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 November 2011	Committee decision to delist
13 February 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 8, Ahmed Ali Nur Jim'ale and 23 entities[a] (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
17 March 2011	Transmission of case 8 to the Committee
23 September 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 December 2011	Committee decision to delist six entities
21 February 2012	Committee decision to delist one individual and 17 entities
8 June 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

[a] Barakaat North America, Inc., Barakat Computer Consulting, Barakat Consulting Group, Barakat Global Telephone Company, Barakat Post Express, Barakat Refreshment Company, Al Baraka Exchange, L.L.C, Barakaat Telecommunications Co. Somalia, Ltd., Barakaat Bank of Somalia, Barako Trading Company, L.L.C, Al-Barakaat, Al-Barakaat Bank, Al-Barakaat Bank of Somalia, Al-Barakat Finance Group, Al-Barakat Financial Holding Co., Al-Barakat Global Telecommunications, Al-Barakat Group of Companies Somalia Limited, Al-Barakat International, Al-Barakat Investments, Barakaat Group of Companies, Barakaat Red Sea Telecommunications, Barakat International Companies and Barakat Telecommunications Company Limited.

Case 9, Saad Rashed Mohammed Al-Faqih and Movement for Reform in Arabia (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
19 April 2011	Transmission of case 9 to the Committee
21 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
1 July 2012	Committee decision to delist
13 November 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 10, Ibrahim Abdul Salam Mohamed Boyasseer (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
6 May 2011	Transmission of case 10 to the Committee
9 January 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 March 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 11, Mondher ben Mohsen ben Ali al-Baazaoui (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
1 June 2011	Transmission of case 11 to the Committee
19 January 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 March 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 March 2012	Committee decision to delist
10 July 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 12, Kamal ben Mohamed ben Ahmed Darraji (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
30 June 2011	Transmission of case 12 to the Committee
28 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
4 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 13, Fondation Secours Mondial (Status: amended)[b]

Date	*Description*
7 July 2011	Transmission of case 13 to the Committee
14 December 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 January 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 February 2012	Committee decision to amend
9 July 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

[b] Amended to be removed as an alias of Global Relief Foundation (QE.G.91.02).

Case 14, Sa'd Abdullah Hussein al-Sharif (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
20 July 2011	Transmission of case 14 to the Committee
29 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 April 2012	Committee decision to delist
5 June 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 15, Fethi ben al-Rebei Absha Mnasri (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
4 August 2011	Transmission of case 15 to the Committee
9 March 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 16, Mounir Ben Habib Ben al-Taher Jarraya (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
15 August 2011	Transmission of case 16 to the Committee
9 March 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 17, Rachid Fettar (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
26 September 2011	Transmission of case 17 to the Committee
27 April 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 June 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 18, Ali Mohamed El Heit (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
5 October 2011	Transmission of case 18 to the Committee
2 May 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 July 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 July 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 19, Yassin Abdullah Kadi (listed as Yasin Abdullah Ezzedine Qadi) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
16 November 2011	Transmission of case 19 to the Committee
11 July 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 September 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
5 October 2012	Committee decision to delist

Case 20, Chabaane ben Mohamed ben Mohamed al-Trabelsi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
21 November 2011	Transmission of case 20 to the Committee
23 April 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 June 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 21, Adel Abdul Jalil Ibrahim Batterjee (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
3 January 2012	Transmission of case 21 to the Committee
10 October 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
6 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 January 2013	Committee decision to delist
5 September 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 22, Ibrahim ben Hedhili ben Mohamed al-Hamami (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
6 February 2012	Transmission of case 22 to the Committee
25 September 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
6 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
21 November 2012	Committee decision to delist
7 February 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 23, Suliman Hamd Suleiman Al-Buthe (Status: delisted) (Repeated request)

Date	*Description*
23 February 2012	Transmission of case 23 to the Committee
30 August 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
27 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
10 February 2013	Committee decision to delist
30 August 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 24, Mamoun Darkazanli (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
28 February 2012	Transmission of case 24 to the Committee
12 November 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 January 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
11 March 2013	Committee decision to delist
30 August 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 25, Abdullahi Hussein Kahie (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
28 February 2012	Transmission of case 25 to the Committee
26 July 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 September 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
26 September 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 26, Usama Muhammed Awad Bin Laden (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 21 February 2013

Date	*Description*
23 April 2012	Transmission of case 26 to the Committee
15 February 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 February 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 27, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
7 May 2012	Transmission of case 27 to the Committee
11 February 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
7 May 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
7 May 2013	Committee decision to retain listing
12 June 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 28, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
7 June 2012	Transmission of case 28 to the Committee
20 November 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 January 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 January 2013	Committee decision to retain listing
29 January 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 29, Muhammad 'Abdallah Salih Sughayr (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
25 July 2012	Transmission of case 29 to the Committee
9 April 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 May 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 July 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 30, Lajnat Al Daawa Al Islamiya (LDI) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
25 July 2012	Transmission of case 30 to the Committee
15 April 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
2 July 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 September 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 31, Abd al Hamid Sulaiman Muhammed al-Mujil (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
1 August 2012	Transmission of case 31 to the Committee
13 March 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
30 April 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 June 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 32, Mohamed ben Mohamed ben Khalifa Abdelhedi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
19 September 2012	Transmission of case 32 to the Committee
5 March 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
16 April 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
1 May 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 33, Mohammed Daki (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
12 October 2012	Transmission of case 33 to the Committee
28 May 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
30 July 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
16 August 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 34, Abdelghani Mzoudi (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 18 March 2013

Date	*Description*
8 November 2012	Transmission of case 34 to the Committee
18 March 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 35, International Islamic Relief Organization, Philippines, branch offices (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 December 2012	Transmission of case 35 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist

Case 36, International Islamic Relief Organization, Indonesia, branch office (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 December 2012	Transmission of case 36 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist

Case 37, Jaber Abdullah Jaber Ahmed Al-Jalahmah (Status: delisted)[c]

Date	*Description*
4 February 2013	Transmission of case 37 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist

[c] Jaber Abdullah Jaber Ahmed Al-Jalahmah was relisted on the same date by a separate Committee decision.

Case 38, Moustafa Abbas (listed as Moustafa Abbes) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 February 2013	Transmission of case 38 to the Committee
12 August 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 September 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 September 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 39, Atilla Selek (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 February 2013	Transmission of case 39 to the Committee
2 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 40, Youssef ben Abdul Baki Ben Youcef Abdaoui (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
4 March 2013	Transmission of case 40 to the Committee
14 November 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
11 February 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 April 2014	Committee decision to delist

Case 41, L'hadi Bendebka (listed as Abdelhadi Ben Debka) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
12 March 2013	Transmission of case 41 to the Committee
14 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
18 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 42, Youcef Abbas (listed as Youcef Abbes) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
4 March 2013	Transmission of case 42 to the Committee
2 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
15 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 43, Said Yousef AbouAziz (listed as Said Youssef Ali Abu Aziza) (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 26 August 2013

Date	*Description*
27 March 2013	Transmission of case 43 to the Committee
26 August 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 44, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
2 May 2013	Transmission of case 44 to the Committee
4 February 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 April 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
21 April 2014	Committee decision to retain listing
30 July 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 45, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
6 May 2013	Transmission of case 45 to the Committee
9 December 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
11 February 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
11 February 2014	Committee decision to retain listing
17 March 2014	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 46, Yacine Ahmed Nacer (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
10 May 2013	Transmission of case 46 to the Committee
30 December 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
25 February 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
13 March 2014	Committee decision to delist

Case 47, Nabil Benatia (listed as Nabil ben Mohamed ben Ali ben Attia) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
3 June 2013	Transmission of case 47 to the Committee
12 November 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 48, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

Date	*Description*
17 June 2013	Transmission of case 48 to the Committee
19 March 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 June 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee

Case 49, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
24 June 2013	Transmission of case 49 to the Committee
3 April 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 June 2014	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
24 June 2014	Committee decision to retain listing

Case 50, one entity (Status: Committee phase)

Date	*Description*
5 September 2013	Transmission of case 50 to the Committee
30 June 2014	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 51, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

Date	*Description*
28 October 2013	Transmission of case 51 to the Committee
18 August 2014	Deadline for completion of the dialogue phase

Case 52, one individual (Status: information-gathering phase)

Date	*Description*
27 May 2014	Transmission of case 52 to the Committee
29 September 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase

Case 53, one individual (Status: information-gathering phase)

Date	*Description*
13 June 2014	Transmission of case 53 to the Committee
13 October 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase

Case 54, one individual (Status: information-gathering phase)

Date	*Description*
19 June 2014	Transmission of case 54 to the Committee
20 October 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase

Case 55, one individual (Status: information-gathering phase)

Date	*Description*
23 June 2014	Transmission of case 55 to the Committee
23 October 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase